DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 164 UD 019 255

TITLE	A Conversation with the Reverend Jesse Jackson: The Quest for Economic and Educational Parity.
INSTITUTION	American Enterprise Inst. for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	31p.; Not available in hard copy due to institution's restriction
AVAILABLE FROM	American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1150 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.25)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Affirmative Action; *Black Attitudes; *Blacks; Civil Rights; *Economic Status; *Educational Opportunities; *Employment Opportunities; Equal Education; Mass Media; Race Relations; *Racial Discrimination
IDENTIFIERS	Bakke (Allan); *Jackson (Jesse)

ABSTRACT

This booklet contains an edited transcript of a visit by the black civil rights leader to the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) in May 1978. Reverend Jackson addresses issues that go beyond the freedoms won in the civil rights movement toward the goals of educational and economic parity for all Americans. AEI scholars and fellows, representatives of the media, and representatives of the Ford Foundation and Mobil Oil Corporation question Reverend Jackson on the state of black America. Topics covered include: (1) the black vote and politics; (2) the moral authority of the media in the absence of blacks in executive positions with newspapers and television; (3) economic development of urban areas and job creation; (4) the income gap between blacks and whites; (5) foreign policy, particularly in Africa; and (6) affirmative action for minorities and the question of reverse discrimination. (Author/EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169164

MAR 2 6 1979

A Conversation with the Reverend Jesse Jackson

The Quest for Economic and Educational Parity

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Getrich
Amer. Enterprise Institute
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

UDO 19255

Held on May 16, 1978
at the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research
Washington, D.C.

ISBN 0-8447-3311-3

AEI Studies 209

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 78-14151

© 1978 by American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C. Permission to quote from or to reproduce materials in this publication is granted when due acknowledgment is made.
The views expressed in the publications of the American Enterprise Institute are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the staff, advisory panels, officers, or trustees of AEI.

Printed in the United States of America

The Reverend Jesse Jackson at the American Enterprise Institute, with AEI Resident Fellow Robert L. Woodson.

Introduction

In this provocative discussion, black leader Rev. Jesse Jackson argues that "freedom" and "equality," words that are used interchangeably by many, are not interchangeable terms. Since freedom has been won by the civil rights movement, the goal of the struggle must now be educational and economic equity and parity.

In regard to economic goals, Jackson charges that the income gap between whites and blacks has been growing wider. The term "reverse discrimination," he says, gives the impression that whites are losing ground because they have been held back while blacks catch up. He argues, however, that there are 48 percent more whites in medical school and 64 percent more whites in law school today than there were in 1970. And the jobs lost by white workers at major industrial plants have gone not to blacks but to other countries, where cheap labor is available. Investment money, he says, has also gone abroad.

Jackson charges that desegregation may be the law, but the intent of desegregation is not being realized. There are only five blacks in executive positions on the 1,769 daily newspapers in the United States, according to Jackson, and there is no black decision maker on network news, no black liaison officer between black America and the White House, and no blacks on the boards of most of the major labor unions.

Jackson's own response to this situation was to develop Operation PUSH, a national campaign to "Push for Excellence." This program for the development of self-reliance among young blacks emphasizes education, character development, and the exercise of the right to vote. PUSH has also challenged the employment practices of Chicago businesses through selective buying campaigns and through other direct action strategies.

Reverend Jackson, an ordained minister, has been active in the

civil rights movement since its earliest days. He worked as a field director for Martin Luther King, Jr., and was national director of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference's Operation Breadbasket. In 1971 Reverend Jackson founded Operation PUSH, which involves principals, teachers, ministers, union leaders, and members of the media in an effort to improve the achievement levels of black youngsters in the nation's public schools. In 1977, he was given the Golden Key Award, presented annually by the American Association of School Administrators, for his contributions to the improvement of national welfare.

ROBERT L. WOODSON
Resident Fellow
American Enterprise Institute

A Conversation with the Reverend Jesse Jackson

ROBERT L. WOODSON, American Enterprise Institute: Rev. Jesse Jackson is an associate minister of the Fellowship Baptist Church in Chicago, where he lives with his wife and five children. He was born in Greenville, South Carolina.

After graduation from high school there, Reverend Jackson attended the University of Illinois and the North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, where he received his bachelor of science degree in sociology.

In 1971 he was a delegate to the African-American Dialogue in Lagos, Nigeria; in 1963 he was a delegate to the World Assembly of Youth. Reverend Jackson was appointed national director of SCLC Operation Breadbasket in 1967 by the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. He remained in that position until 1971, when he founded Operation PUSH, People United to Save Humanity.

Reverend Jackson has lectured to numerous national organizations and has been the recipient of many awards. In 1977 he was given the Golden Key Award, which is presented annually by the American Association of School Administrators at their annual convention to a citizen who has contributed significantly to the national welfare. He has received honorary doctorate degrees from seventeen colleges and universities throughout this country.

Reverend Jackson currently writes a syndicated column for the *Los Angeles Times*, which appears in three dozen newspapers around the country.

REVEREND JACKSON: Thank you very much. First of all, I would like to express to you how delighted I am to have this opportunity today to engage in dialogue. I will try to make my presentation as brief as I can and to open up the meeting for as much discussion as possible.

The difference between where we are now and where we were ten years ago, when there was a tremendous pressure upon us to demon-

strate and to engage in forms of drama, is that at that time we called our movement a freedom movement. That was an accurate description, because segregation eliminated our options—we did not have freedom. We did not have the freedom to use public accommodations; we did not have the freedom to vote; we did not have the freedom of open housing; our options were reduced. In some sense, in the 1960s the public accommodations bill, the voting rights bill, and the open housing bill gave us freedom. But beyond freedom, the goal must be equity and parity, or equality.

Many people use the words "freedom" and "equality" interchangeably, but they're not interchangeable terms because equality can be measured—it can be turned into numbers. Now we are free to register and to vote; now our challenge is, indeed, to register and to vote, and to vote according to our vested interest. There are 16 million blacks eligible to vote, and only 9 million are registered to vote. So there is a challenge for us to take full advantage of that measure of political freedom and then to vote according to our vested interest, freedom.

When we speak about equity and parity, we begin to talk about issues such as quotas, which brought about the *DeFunis* versus *Odegaard* suit in Washington, or we begin to talk about affirmative action, which has brought about, of course, the *Bakke* case. *DeFunis* versus *Odegaard* or *Bakke* would not have been issues in 1960, because they deal with something other than what we were dealing with in 1960 or, indeed, in 1968. The goal of our struggle now has to be educational equity and parity, and economic equity and parity. We must measure our relationships with our allies by how willing they are to help us achieve equality and parity, which really is beyond freedom.

In economics, the income gap is getting wider. We're not achieving equity and parity. The reason we focus on education is that this gap is getting wider.

In the last few years the term "reverse discrimination" has been used. It gives the impression that whites are losing ground because the white majority has made a decision against its best interest, which has not happened. It gives the impression that some whites are not moving as fast as they want to move because they have been held back, while blacks catch up. The fact is, there are 48 percent more whites in medical school today than there were in 1970; there are 64 percent more whites in law school now than there were then. If on a scale of 100, sixteen seats are set aside for blacks—and I might add that those sixteen would be split up among various ethnic groups—more than sixteen seats have been added to the 100 for whites.

There is no reverse discrimination. If white America feels its ex-

pansion is slowing down, the pressure is not coming from black America and the drive for affirmative action. The jobs that the white workers had at the Zenith plant in Chicago have gone to Mexicans, not to Watts. The steel workers' jobs that were lost in Youngstown, Ohio, have not gone to Harlem. They've gone to Tokyo.

The money that many white Americans expected to be available for investment has gone to the Pacific rim. Last year, out of $160 billion for capital investment, $32 billion went abroad. One dollar out of every five dollars now goes abroad, and with those dollars goes a tremendous number of jobs. Therefore much of the pressure that white America feels is not coming from black America. We've become a rather visible scapegoat, and when terms like reverse discrimination are used, they give a false impression.

Bakkeism is really not against preferential treatment; that's not the issue that's being raised. There's no resistance to the rich having preferential acceptance in universities—it's called cultural mix, and nobody resists sitting next to the rich. Nobody's resisting the super athletes' coming to the major white universities; nobody resists the children of faculty or alumni having preferential acceptance. In a real sense, Bakkeism is racism; it is resistance to our mobility. It is saying, "You may have freedom, but you cannot have equity and parity." What is at stake in the Supreme Court now is whether or not the culture will support our urge for equity and power.

One of my concerns is that the movement must revisit the South. We've done quite a bit of work there lately. In spite of a rash of positive publicity because the President is from the South, we have found that in many instances people's hearts have not changed—only their strategies have changed. The same forces that were in power controlling segregation are now in power controlling desegregation. They're using desegregation to the same ends that they used segregation.

The interpretation of the South is that black authority figures and black educational institutions, by definition, do not have relevance. It is thought that desegregation is not complete until black colleges are eliminated. To the blacks desegregation means elimination, and to the whites it means expansion.

Across the board, black colleges have 10 percent white enrollment, but they are called black. If 2 percent of the enrollment of white universities is black—and most of them high-powered athletes—it's called open. And so there is a lot of discussion about whether or not we should maintain essentially black colleges, whether they have relevance, and whether they have relevance in an open society.

No one suggests that Harvard and Yale, which are essentially

WASP even though others may attend, should go out of business; or that Catholic University and Notre Dame, which are essentially Catholic even though others may attend, should go out of business; or that Brandeis and Yeshiva, which are essentially Jewish though others may attend, should go out of business. But there is always the question of whether Howard and other black institutions should, in fact, stay in business. Again that's because the people in power are making the definitions and helping to determine the rules of the game.

Thus, we must revisit the South because the misuse of definition is now working against us. In South Carolina in 1954, 43 percent of the teachers were black; in 1966, 34 percent were black; in 1976, 29 percent black. It is projected that by 1980, 15 to 20 percent will be black.

In Greenville, South Carolina, where I come from, 25 percent of the students in the county are black. There are sixteen high schools, all with white principals. In the last ten years we've lost black principals, teachers, coaches, and chorus and band directors. Our only increase has been in suspensions and expulsions.

Therefore, there must be a review of what is happening because the intent of desegregation is, in fact, not being realized. The National Teachers Exam is being misused by the state of South Carolina essentially as a tool to eliminate black teachers. Even the designers of the exam at Princeton said it is being misused. I believe in tests. I think we need competency tests. But tests ought to be used to detect and diagnose and recommend and remedy, not to punish.

If a competency exam is given in the twelfth grade, it indicates what the student does not know at that level, and also what the teacher has not taught. But there is no punishment for the teacher, only for the student, because the teacher is protected by the union, and the student is protected by no one. If a test is given in the eighth grade to detect what the student does not know, then for the next four years the curriculum can be married with the testing mechanism. The system has an obligation to help the students overcome whatever deficiencies they may have. And tests should be given not for punitive reasons but for remedial reasons.

Another area of concern is the tremendous focus on President Carter. I think, in some measure, the media have much to do with this, and the power of his office has much to do with this. Invariably we are asked on programs what we think of Carter. And there's always the expectation of a kind of simplistic answer—good guy, bad guy—but it doesn't quite come out that way. There are some pluses and some minuses. The racial hostility and coldness that existed during the Nixon years are not there now. That's a plus. The appointment of Joe Califano, Andy Young, Pat Harris, and Ray Marshall—each one, in my

judgment, a person of broad sensitivities—will involve more people in the national consciousness. Those are pluses. The statement of an urban policy, at least the recognition of the need for one, even though it is perhaps inadequately financed, is a plus, in terms of its recommendations.

The minus side is that there is still far more symbolism than substance. The job question has not really been attacked as we were promised that it was going to be attacked. There is no commitment to economic development, it seems, in the black and brown communities. Some black people want jobs, but many black people want wealth. They don't go to school to study business administration and finance and banking just to get a job, but to build banks, and to build insurance companies, and to have a stake in the revival of the areas in which they live.

Press attention is put on the White House because it can be reduced to "a house" with "a man." But we are not giving the kind of attention we must to the Congress, which is faceless and is even resisting such recommendations as the President is making; nor to the business community, which is faceless and at this point not assuming its responsibility; nor to labor, which parades as the ally of the black and the poor, and whose trade union policies are more racially resistant than business has thought about being in the last ten years; nor to the mass media itself, which in a greater measure helps determine the agenda of the nation.

We need to face the fact that there are 1,769 daily newspapers in America, but only five blacks are in executive positions on the 1,769. There's not a black making a decision on network television news, morning or night—not a one. While the media focus a lot on Watergate and Koreagate, they really have a mediagate of their own that they need to investigate. They cannot continue using all the authority and the privileges that come from the First Amendment, which must be protected legally, and at the same time jeopardize their moral authority by being less qualified to be judgmental than the people they judge. Almost any of the major institutions challenged by the media could double right back on the media and say, "By what authority do you speak?" I am concerned that we not get trapped into asking only the President about his priorities, without asking the same question of the executive, the judicial, and the legislative branches. For example, when the Supreme Court shifted its attention from evidence to intent, it dealt a tremendous blow to our drive for equity and parity.

The challenge of self-reliance for black and poor America cannot be overlooked. Someone has given out the mistaken notion the last few years that self-reliance is a kind of conservative idea. In fact, it is rather

radical and revolutionary. Dependency belongs with the slavery syndrome. Self-reliance is resistance to domination and occupation. It's what Jesus meant when he said, "The Kingdom of God is within." Freedom is not going to come from some chariot from the sky, which is superstitious; it's going to come from our own will to organize and break out from under oppression.

It's what Gandhi meant when he said that freedom for Indian people will not come from some parliament in India, it will come from their own soul force.

It's what Mao meant when he said that the Chinese will be freed by China.

It is what Martin Luther King meant when he said, "Better we walk in dignity than ride in shame."

It is resistance to a dependency syndrome, looking within for the change we seek. When we have moved from the back of the bus, it's because we wouldn't go back there one day. We made that decision. If we have public accommodations, it's because we sat in and refused to move one day. If we have the right to vote, it's because we marched from Selma to Montgomery one day. If we have open housing, it's because we marched into Cicero one day. If we came out of Vietnam, it's because we stopped going.

And if we are to get the kind of urban policy that we need and jobs in place of excuses, it's going to be because we resist the passivity of television, move into more forms of action, and apply the necessary pressure to bring about the changes we seek and to fulfill the goals of justice. Thank you very much.

Questions and Answers

MR. WOODSON: Thank you. I would like to begin with a question.

When you spoke before the Republican National Committee in January of this year, you encouraged the party to actively court the black vote. In response, a number of Washington columnists chided Bill Brock, the party's chairman, for such attempts, warning him that such a drive is unrealistic. Blacks were interested primarily in New Deal welfare and public service, they said, and this was antithetical to the interest and needs of poor, low-income whites, who were interested in issues of reverse discrimination or quotas. Could you comment on that?

REVEREND JACKSON: Well, those are columnists who were doing more writing than reading. There is evidence, substantial evidence, that Mr.

Brock made that gesture because he does not have a suicide complex. [Laughter.] And because Mr. Brock can count to ten, he recognizes that the Republican party abandoned the black vote.

You see, the impression is that blacks don't vote Republican because we're not intelligent enough to vote for two parties. It is thought that no matter what is offered to us politically, we're so religiously committed to the Democratic party, and are so dumb, that we would vote only Democratic. As late as 1960, however, because of a legacy, a historical thing between blacks and whites, Nixon carried Fulton County, Dr. King's county, with the black vote, even though Kennedy got Dr. King out of jail. This was because for eight years Nixon had done substantial civil rights work for the Eisenhower administration in the black community. Blacks vote for Javits and Brooke and Percy and Mathias; in Chicago we have a Republican state's attorney and an attorney general elected by a split vote. The black vote is as diverse as the vote of any group, except that we have no choice but to vote race as our vested interest when a Reagan or a Goldwater introduces race as a factor. We can't deal with issues such as economics when they make race a vested interest proposition.

I think it would also be fair to say that in the 1976 election it was the Republican party and all its strategists that made the mistake, not us. They decided to abandon the black vote. In Ohio, where the Republicans lost by 3,000 votes, neither Ford nor Dole made one visit to the black community—not one. In Pennsylvania, where they lost by 65,000 votes, they did not go to the black community one time. And thus, by their own miscalculations, they really lost an election.

I contend that 16 million eligible black votes are too real to be ignored, and it makes good mathematical sense to recognize this fact. Seven million blacks, voting in one direction, would be hard to overcome in national elections. Even the most dyed-in-the-wool reactionary must come to grips with this reality. In my judgment, therefore, blacks must first, maintain the right to vote; second, fully register and vote; and third, vote according to our interest.

If the Republican party merely says, "Speak to us," that's not enough. If it merely spends a few more dollars to appeal to us to register, trying to exploit some ambivalences toward Carter, that is not enough. Its policies must begin to reflect our vested interest if it is, in fact, to compete for our vote en masse.

MS. CHARLENE HUNTER-GAULT, "McNeil Lehrer Report": You're speaking within the context of a ten-year span of history. When the media examined that ten-year span, they came to the conclusion that the country is no longer moving toward two separate societies but

toward three—white society, black middle class, and black lower class—and shifted the burden to the black middle class. The only thoughtful analysis I've seen on that conclusion was in the *Washington Post*, and I'd like to know how you read that shift.

REVEREND JACKSON: That's an attempt to shift the burden to the group least capable of bearing it. The black middle class is not the reason the black lower class is unemployed in growing numbers. The black middle class has not determined the terms of free trade. The black middle class is not responsible for the crisis of inflation in the society. The black middle class is not the reason why blacks are behind in medicine, in law, in engineering, in the building trades. Shifting the blame to the black middle class is so absurd that it's difficult to respond to the idea rationally. It has no basis in fact. Most black middle class people I know are simply one sneeze away from unemployment; they cannot afford to catch a cold or they'd be right out of those houses. The black middle class, which in fact is not growing, is too small to be identified as the reason poor blacks are where they are, or the reason poor blacks have more poor white neighbors, in the same economic class, than they had ten years ago.

TOM BETHEL, *Harper's* magazine: You said the Republican policies should reflect your vested interests. How can this be construed as anything other than policies that would increase black dependence on government, which would be contrary to the argument of self-reliance that you gave us here?

REVEREND JACKSON: The Republicans are reputed to be very strong in terms of business alliances. Even though the Republican political party is out of power, Republican businesses of this country are not out of power. Why can't they put together a program of affirmative action by their own assertion, rather than wait for government intervention and challenge? We have not yet seen the National Republican Alliance of Businessmen put forth a program.

There are more white Americans than black Americans living in urban America, so urban policy and blacks cannot be seen as synonymous. It is not enough to be against Carter's urban policy. What is the Republican urban policy? If the Republican party puts forth an urban policy based upon economic principles that offer economic incentives for businesses to remain or relocate, it's going to appeal to the beneficiaries of those profits and of those jobs. At this point, to be anti-Carter is not a creative way to get to the Kingdom of God, in my judgment. I can't think of a sound economic policy that would affect

black people that would not help white people more. When people become schizophrenic on the issue of race, they cannot even see pure numbers.

JIM WEIGHART, *New York Daily News:* We have now gone through a recession that has lasted through about four years of long recovery, through two administrations. The Ford administration's basic plan to end the recession was through economic stimulus, the major portion of which was a tax cut. The Carter administration has also placed great reliance on a tax cut as a means of stimulating the economy, instead of government expenditures in specific areas, like massive job creation, public works, or urban policy. Why is it that with the influence blacks have in the Democratic party and within the Democratic administration, more pressure can't be brought to bear on this administration to reverse that economic policy, if it is in your best interest? You might comment on the policy itself, if you don't agree with that.

REVEREND JACKSON: One of the problems that we have about being so one-sided in our voting is that we have maximum power in the party, but minimum leverage. When Vernon Jordan and Ben Hooks and Jesse Jackson and Coretta King and others make recommendations, they are not necessarily heard in proportion to our vote. We do not have, at this point, a credible black of significant political stature, as liaison officer between the White House and black America. Johnson and Kennedy had Louie Martin, a man of stature; Nixon had Bob Brown, a man to whom he gave stature and who used it to become a fairly visible conduit. Carter does not yet have such an officer, in spite of the fact that a request for one has been made at every meeting I have been to. We are far more visible at the White House now at social affairs than ever before, but we are not much more visible where policies are being made.

HUGH PRICE, editorial board of the *New York Times:* If you had been the architect of President Carter's urban policy, what would have been the highlights of that policy? Where does the substance of the policy fail, in your judgment?

REVEREND JACKSON: You're going to make me stretch my imagination. The first area obviously would be a greater commitment to job creation. I am still of the school of thought that believes when jobs are created—whether by providing incentives for private business to open up more jobs or by providing them through the government itself—when people move to more productive forms of work and become

more creative, they help expand the consumer base and reduce the crime base. A lot of positive things happen from creating jobs as an alternative to welfare and despair.

I'm very impressed with the idea of economic incentives to save businesses that already exist, or to appeal to businesses to come—but I'm not sure that economic incentives are enough. They appear to me to be merely a gesture in the right direction. I would know that the policy has substance if Zenith no longer had a greater incentive to go to Mexico than to stay in Chicago. Then I would know that the policy provides the measures needed for survival.

So the areas I would focus on are job creation, economic development, and the creative idea of not just putting money into a given community but of using money as leverage to force state and local governments to cooperate in new ways. Greater incentives should be provided for businesses to use the American labor base and educational base and the strategic location of American cities.

BEN DUDLEY, WHUR Radio: How would job programs as you see them differ from those that have existed in the past? You wind up with bottom-level jobs no matter who provides them, be it government or private industry.

REVEREND JACKSON: First of all, one concern would be to have bottom-level jobs rather than no jobs, as a base. A second concern would be to have vertical mobility as we aim for equity and parity with jobs.

My great concern now is that we have an economic policy that allows us to lose steel jobs to Japan, textile jobs to the Pacific, and electronics jobs to Mexico. We lose jobs paying $8 and $10 an hour, and replace them with Comprehensive Employment Training Act jobs, so that the people are still working, but are they *really* working? I'm concerned about the quality of jobs, and our economic policy right now is terrible for the American worker. American workers can compete with foreign workers in terms of production, but they cannot compete with the slave labor forces of totalitarian regimes. I see it as a fundamental weakness in our foreign policy.

BOB BATES, Mobil Oil Corporation: Yesterday I heard you say that the Senate's proposal to provide arms in the Middle East was an effective way to maintain the balance of peace. Do you feel that same kind of policy, if applied to southern Africa—that is, provision of guns to both sides of the battle in southern Africa—would indeed balance the peace in that part of the world?

REVEREND JACKSON: Oh, yes. I think we've got two choices in South Africa—either disarm the white South Africans or arm the black ones. That's only fair. How can we say in the Middle East that we've got three friends, and we give arms to one friend but don't give any to two other friends? I don't understand the logic of that. How can we trust white South Africans with guns and not trust black South Africans with guns? We would need to disarm one, or arm both. My preference would be to disarm one, and to use our economic strength, which we are not now using, and our political strength, in terms of recognition of South Africa.

I think we are paying more lip service to Africa than ever before. It's good that the President is going there and that Andy Young is our ambassador. But we have not yet applied to South Africa the same fierceness we applied to Cuba. If we can impose an embargo on Cuba because Castro ran a lot of gangsters out of there and reorganized the economy, we can use the same kind of strength, if our sincerity is commensurate, in South Africa.

MS. HUNTER-GAULT: What impact do you think a pro-Bakke decision would have on the larger issues of equity and parity, not only in education but in employment and other areas?

REVEREND JACKSON: A pro-Bakke decision would simply give dignity and official status to the hard-hat movement. It would be, in some sense, the official stopping of the reconstruction movement of the century. The affirmative action provisions are like the presence of the federal troops in the South in the last century. To take that away would be like pulling out the troops again, and some of the same kinds of things would begin to happen. It would have the effect of making many people more cynical than they are, which would be unfortunate.

I would hope that we would not lose the decision, that at worst it would be sent back to the state of California, which it never should have left, in my judgment. But if we do come to have an obligation to rebel, that rebellion may take the form of major sit-ins on college campuses, showing that we will rebel nonviolently until we are protected with provisions for our share, to assure our orderly growth and development. It may take the form of street demonstrations in selected cities; it may take the form of selected boycotts against major companies that want our consumer dollars but do not want to hire and promote us. We cannot simply stand by and feel bad about the fact that the judges did not rule in our favor.

If they do rule in our favor, I will still argue that simply having an opportunity is not enough. Equal opportunity, on the one hand, must

be matched by superior effort on the other. There is no substitute for superior effort for those who would advocate social change. There must be a dialectic—and it must be made very lively—between equal opportunity and superior effort.

As you know, one of my concerns is that many members of this generation have been diverted by addiction to the mass media and have become so passive that their effort has fallen off. Others have been victims of moral decay, tripping out on drugs and alcohol, violence, and premature pregnancy; they have lost some of the moral fiber necessary to fight the great struggle.

MR. DUDLEY: To Mr. Bates's question about American foreign policy, America has sold its jets to Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Israel, and this morning's *Washington Post* said that the Saudis were becoming concerned about Soviet and Cuban intervention in black African states. At the same time, America is supposedly improving its dialogue with those same black African states. I just want to know your position on that; it seems to be becoming a very delicate balance.

REVEREND JACKSON: I don't pretend to be an expert on foreign policy. I have some opinions based upon such information as I am privy to. I start from the premise that it is totally unrealistic to ask people who are desperate for survival to be too choosy about who their help comes from. People who are sick don't choose their doctors by ideology. They choose their doctors by availability.

When our country had the greatest acceptance in Africa, we had a benign African policy. Now the whole world has recognized, at about the same time as we have, that Africa is mighty important, and therefore there's some competition. Africa has so many resources that it is necessary to the rest of the world. It will be competed for, and part of its salvation will be in how it handles those that compete for it. That's just good sound judgment.

On the other hand, I'm against the escalation of arms, and I'm always talking about how we ought to reduce the military budget. But I know disarmament, on the one hand, and balance of power, on the other, contribute mightily to peace. If people become Socialist or Marxist, that will not necessarily represent the death of America. The notion that it will is not well founded. People in developing countries might go more toward collectivism than toward individualism for very practical reasons. When the masses are bringing the revolution, they bring in an economic philosophy of the masses as opposed to a struggle by individuals, like Davy Crockett. That would be almost unrealistic in many of those countries.

On the other hand, we worked out trade relations with Russia, and they certainly do not hold Adam Smith to be the great kingpin. We worked out trade relations with China and Cuba, and other countries of all stripes. There is no evidence that because countries have collective economies as opposed to our form that our money will not be spent there, that our advisers will not be accepted there, that our relationships will not be accepted there. There is no evidence of that.

MIKE BALZANO, American Enterprise Institute: Mr. Jackson, over the past twenty to thirty years, the public policy decisions of the federal government have created social programs which were distributed through federal bureaucracies. As you probably know, Mr. Woodson is working on a mediating structures project at AEI, which is of interest to a number of sociologists. We are looking at what the social services would be like—how they would actually operate in the communities—if, instead of being administered by bureaucracies at the federal level, social services would be channeled through organizations at the community level. A number of these organizations have been identified, such as the family, voluntary organizations, and churches. Should public policy take a turn in this direction and begin to put money into community structures? Which do you think would be the most relevant in the black community? And would this kind of approach be viable in the black community?

REVEREND JACKSON: Although the federal government is bureaucratic, almost by necessity because of its size, I'm not sure that basic community-level structures have the competence to produce even as much as the government itself produces. There should be a closer alliance between the two, with greater input. But to run a significant program and to produce a quality product requires more than desire and desperation. It requires a level of competence that often does not exist in the community.

When the government does participate, it ought to relate more to developing institutions. For example, during the war on poverty, if the money had gone into the poverty banks—the black banks and the Hispanic banks—those institutions would now be capable of giving more service. If they had invested in the *Chicago Defender*, a black daily newspaper, it could have become a viable competitive daily newspaper. Instead there are sixty little flash sheets a week in every little community organization where some money was dropped. An institution could have been built and the structure would have survived the pull-out of federal funds, just as the structures built in Europe under the Marshall Plan have survived the pull-out. We didn't go into Europe

with the Marshall Plan to build and glorify community organizations; we built structures. Once they caught on, those structures became permanent. Money should also go to our insurance companies, which use the best of our experience and expertise.

BILL PIERCE, *Washington Post* Writers Group: I understood you to say a while ago that labor parades as an ally of black and poor people, but its policies are more racist than business ever thought of being. Did I understand you correctly? And if so, could you elaborate?

REVEREND JACKSON: The last time I went to jail I was trying to get the right to build a school in the black community in direct confrontation with the labor movement. Although I think we have many things in common with labor, the price of our alliance cannot be dishonesty, nor can we make progress if we simply offer blind loyalty.

The notion that the minimum wage ought to be raised served a few people well, but not black teenagers. That's the reality of that. Labor has no aggressive program to allow young blacks into the unions to be glaziers and brick masons and asbestos workers and plumbers; there is strong resistance there. At this point, there are some pressures on businesses that make them open up to women and blacks, but the same pressures are not put on labor to make it open up to blacks and youth. I think that has to be tried.

MR. BALZANO: May I follow up on that question? We talk about labor as though labor is some kind of monolith.

REVEREND JACKSON: It is.

MR. BALZANO: Surely that's not true of the auto workers. The policy you suggest is not followed by all labor unions. The American steel workers union is an open union; the auto workers union is certainly an open union; and so are the electronics workers and the aerospace workers. There are an enormous number of unions across the board that have vigorously recruited minorities and have been open. I think we tend to talk about them as if they were monolithic.

REVEREND JACKSON: I could name the unions I meant. I could mention the auto workers—the likelihood of a black becoming its head ain't at no time forseeable. [Laughter.]

I could mention the steel workers—we make up 33 percent of the union and we've struggled desperately to get a black on the board. I could mention the teamsters, of which we are 32 percent, and we've

struggled desperately to get a boss on its board. I mean that black Americans will be put in the White House twice before a black is put over the AFL-CIO one time. That's what I'm talking about. [Laughter.]

The Democratic party and the Democratic convention and Republican convention, for a lot of reasons, are just much more open to black mobility than those unions are. And I say that as one who identifies with the labor movement, fights for collective bargaining, and believes in livable wages; but at the same time I have no obligation to call the shots other than how I see them.

JAMES C. MILLER III, American Enterprise Institute: You criticized the media and certain business firms for their hiring practices. Secretary of Commerce Juanita Kreps has proposed certain social indices to rate business firms according to their achievement of social goals, one of which, I presume, would be their hiring policies. Do you think this is a good idea? Should it be expanded to encompass the media, labor unions, and other institutions?

REVEREND JACKSON: I think it has a measure of soundness. I'm not totally familiar with it. I want to make it very clear—I know I don't have any problem criticizing the media, but I don't want anybody leaving here feeling scolded. [Laughter.] You know, I don't want anyone saying I came in here like Bert Lance and took advantage of the media. [Laughter.]

That's not my attitude. I believe in freedom of the press, but I think fairness in the press will protect its moral authority to remain a free press. I think its unfairness makes it vulnerable to its enemies. Therefore, I argue, when 1,769 daily newspapers have only five blacks in an executive position, that jeopardizes the moral authority of the media. There are 40,000 employed in daily journalism now, but only 1,700 are black; there were 400 ten years ago, and 1,300 have been hired. About 1,200 of those were hired between 1968 and 1976, with an amazing correlation with the riots. Many of them were hired to take a detail that white reporters would not take. As the fires of those riots died down, the hiring of black journalists also tended to go down.

Since the print media, which is largely private, monopolistic, capitalistic, and family-owned, remains the source from which TV gets most of its news, then its appraisal power must be a matter of major consideration. The media does the appraising, and when it appraises black America as being more violent than whites are, less intelligent than whites are, less hard-working than whites are, and less universal than whites are, we have to challenge its accuracy. When we go behind the print to see why it is inaccurate, we find that the people who were

doing the appraising are largely white, male, and suburban. I'm going to fight for freedom of the press because I think it's a precious thing; I think it's a necessary thing. But there is one way to jeopardize privilege—and that's what it is—privilege is jeopardized by abuse.

MR. WEIGHART: As you say, that is coming preciously close to transgressing First Amendment rights. Would not disseminating information of the kind that you have just said, or rank ordering of the media—some kind of grading of their objectivity in presenting views—have a similar effect without direct regulations?

REVEREND JACKSON: I think that mutual accountability makes for good health in a democracy. When I see editorials often call for teacher accountability, I think they're right. The teachers don't want to hear that, but I think the media is right in calling for teacher accountability. On the other hand, I think if teachers turn around and ask for media accountability, it would be right.

When the press says to civil rights leaders, "Be accountable," meaning, where's your constituency and where does your money come from, and where's your this and where's your that, I think we ought to respond. I think accountability ought to go around the table.

MR. WEIGHART: I'd like to return to the *Bakke* case for just a moment. Some of the people who have expressed reservations about the principles involved in the *Bakke* case have done so even though they say they approve affirmative action. They feel there's something intrinsically wrong with the situation where a man who otherwise meets qualifications for admittance is excluded because there are too many of his kind. I would like to have you comment on that, but I would like to turn it around. What if there was a more rigid quota system that would be satisfactory to blacks—say, 20 percent or whatever. If a black qualified but was excluded because he was one over that quota, would you feel the same way about that instance as you feel about Bakke?

REVEREND JACKSON: Well, that's almost abstract. We've never had that situation. Further evidence is that Bakke's age was too high and his grades were too low—I mean, we ain't rejected no genius; America ain't lost no great statesman. [Laughter.]

When America lost Bakke, it ain't lost no potential President, you know—nothing like that. I think that's the first thing we need to get out.

MR. WEIGHART: He is a man who does have rights. His marks were

much higher than many of those who were accepted, especially among the minority—

REVEREND JACKSON: Let me put this another way. I can only try to explain it by example because I'm not a lawyer or a judge—I'm just a country preacher, trying to share with you what I see.

Suppose two men were running a one-mile race, and it was discovered at the halfway point that the man that was behind had weights on his ankles. The referee said, "This is wrong," and shot the gun and stopped the race, but each man retained his relative position. Then the referee said, "Now that the weights are off your ankles, start again." Unless there was some basis for determining merit based upon the speed of the last two laps, we might ask why anyone bothered to stop the event in the first place? We can understand that in track; we know that's unfair because we're not dealing with a racial issue.

The holocaust of 60 million blacks getting killed, two hundred years of slavery, and another hundred years of official segregation isn't any joke. We have no obligation to take it lightly. We are not behind because of any resistance to work or any lack of intelligence. We were absolutely set behind by national policy. If this nation has any commitment to justice, it cannot judge the race from the end, according to how the people are coming in; it must also judge it by how the people started off. That is the overriding issue. If there is one white doctor for every 649 whites, and one black doctor for every 5,000 blacks, it isn't because we have an aversion to medicine. If there is one white dentist to every 1,900 whites, and one black dentist to every 8,400 blacks, that is the result of our holocaust.

As for asking black Americans to be fair, when the notion came up about a 50 percent write-off for military arms going to Israel, blacks didn't demonstrate against that, and I'll be damned if it's not affirmative action. It's absolutely an affirmative action. It's 50 percent off. We get 50 percent off on nothing, and it's not right. Talk about being consistent! Our policy on the state of Israel is an affirmative action, and we accept it because we think the Jewish people were violated, that they were taken advantage of, that it was the highest and best expression of justice to do that for them. Now we are only saying "Distribute the goodies." We aren't even asking for a precedent to be set—affirmative action really isn't a precedent.

MICHAEL NOVAK, visiting scholar, American Enterprise Institute: Well, it is.

REVEREND JACKSON: When you reduce our entire struggle to one guy's manhood, it distorts the bigger picture.

MR. NOVAK: I could understand that if the facts of the *Bakke* case were somewhat different. I think, unless I'm very wrong, that you're selling blacks short. What was at stake in California was a two-track system in which the black candidates chosen were not the best of the black candidates available in the state of California, but were from a deliberately lower track, on which quite deliberately lower-based candidates were allowed to run. It's a double track.

REVEREND JACKSON: That isn't altogether true—at least those are not the facts that I have.

MR. NOVAK: It's true by the facts of the case. That's also the reason why people thought the *Bakke* case was the very worst kind of case to set before the Supreme Court. There were good affirmative action programs, in which the principle would be defended by a stronger base among the blacks. But the affirmative action candidates in California were chosen deliberately from a second track and were at quite a lower level than they might have been or could have been. No attempt was made to get the best minority candidates.

REVEREND JACKSON: Obviously, if that is a fact, that's a bad proposition for all involved, but that's not our understanding of the facts.

A part of the context is that UCLA is known for Willy Wise, all-American basketball player; Jackie Robinson, football player; Kenny Washington, football player; Kareem Jabbar, Sidney Wicks, et cetera, but UCLA has not graduated five black dentists in its history. It has not graduated four black doctors in its history.

This absolute quota of zero is the context, and we cannot take the *Bakke* case out of this context. If we take it out of context, we are looking at the race at the finish line, rather than looking at it from the starting line. If we take it out of the context, we have a pretext, and we never get to the text. We end up arguing a lot of abstract stuff about Bakke and not dealing with the nation's commitment.

I think that we have a choice; Lyndon Johnson said we have one. We are fighting not only for equality and for freedom but also against a guaranteed finish, which is one kind of commitment. Otherwise we would be stepping away from Lyndon Johnson's position to the other position. Those are our choices. Because we are out of power, we have to live with them, but we consider one unfair, and one fair, for the record.

MR. NOVAK: I think there's one other element in the context. I'm entirely for affirmative action if it's honest. That is to say, if it's a single

track and everybody qualifies, I'm quite in favor of giving sixteen places—or whatever the proper number is—to minority candidates, and maybe all or most of them to blacks, if they are all qualified. That's what happens, by the way, in many affirmative action programs. Those that have been successful, at Harvard, Cornell, and some other places, are run that way.

The case that happened at Davis was very different. That kind of affirmative action breeds a systematic dishonesty, which undercuts all other affirmative action programs and will open us all to the objection that we are racist. Twenty years from now, people will look back and say we deliberately made a two-track system.

REVEREND JACKSON: One of my real concerns about what happened at Davis was the amount of work that the university itself did in helping to prepare Bakke to bring the case. We really don't have Bakke versus the Board of Regents; we have Bakke and the Board of Regents against the Board of Regents. Check that part of the detail.

MR. NOVAK: I know that part.

REVEREND JACKSON: Bakke was rejected at ten other schools, including his own alma mater. We didn't lose any potential Adlai Stevenson or John Foster Dulles when we lost him.

MR. NOVAK: He's a human being, and that's quite enough. When we compete, we get a lot of Stevensons.

REVEREND JACKSON: We don't know the names of the blacks who were rejected, so they are not human beings to us, they're numbers. And the 60 million who were killed before television existed aren't anything but numbers either.

This is a very hot and emotional subject. But the overriding issue, from where I sit, is whether there is a national commitment to equity and parity. Either we affirm that, or we reject that by law. There is no evidence that the American business community, or the American labor community, or the American educational community will voluntarily commit itself to such goals without pressure and leverage. Furthermore, there is no evidence that blacks are behind because of genes. The nation's agenda, our national policies—and not any laziness in blacks—have set us back.

MR. NOVAK: It is important not to allow this case to be settled by a yes or no vote. The Court's decision may apply to the kind of affirmative

action program at Davis, and I think that is the kind of affirmative action program that should be shot down, but all affirmative action should not go up or down on that vote. It's very important to make a distinction between honest and dishonest affirmative action programs.

REVEREND JACKSON: Rather than offering, say, a hundred slots and setting aside sixteen for blacks and other minorities—I might add, of those sixteen, only three went to blacks; more went to Filipinos than to blacks—why not simply add sixteen on the other side and expand it for whites? Guess what? That happened, and nobody is upset about it. That's why there are 48 percent more whites in medical school now than there were then. That's why there are 64 percent more whites in law school. While some of us got sidetracked arguing about whether there should be a few more slots open for blacks, more slots opened for whites, in reaction to the possibility that some might be taken away. None was ever taken away. It's like an issue that never developed. No whites were victims of reverse discrimination. Whites have gained in the stated period. Blacks have gained some slots we never had before, but whites have accelerated more than they ever did before. It's a moot question.

JAMES SHUMAN, American Enterprise Institute: In your introductory remarks you said that the greatest challenge was to build self-reliance. I wonder if you could outline a ten-point program which would involve government, business, private institutions, and individuals, which would do that?

REVEREND JACKSON: Do you all want me to be equal this afternoon or superior? [Laughter.] I mean, you can't even ask a man who's getting paid to do that to do that. [Laughter.] State your question again; let me make sure you're serious.

MR. SHUMAN: I am serious. My question is how would you go about building greater self-reliance? And it doesn't have to be answered by ten points.

REVEREND JACKSON: On the serious side, I think that the notion of developing will power and inner strength, rather than escaping to pill power and copping out, has to be bred in one's formative years. Children must be taught to be more independent and to use their minds and their hands. One of the faults of the public schools is that they are so inclined toward IQ measurement, which is not accurate measurement, that they don't spend enough time on character education.

There's a greater correlation between success and the developed character than between success and the developed IQ. Character includes IQ, but IQ is almost contemptuous of character. We need to measure people not only by grades but by will and integrity and effort and energy and the odds they overcome.

Teaching people to use what they have is a way of making them become more self-reliant. One of our recommendations is that at the end of the senior year in high school the students should receive a diploma in one hand and, if they are or will be eighteen by November 2, a voter registration card in the other. If people who once felt themselves to be impotent are taught what precinct they live in and what the power of a voter card is, then they will learn what their power is. Powerful people tend to be more self-reliant than people who are impotent.

In a given high school, there might be 600 graduating seniors and a couple of hundred teachers. If all of them are registered to vote and if they have been taught how to use that amount of power, then those 800 citizens would develop a power complex relative to society wholly different from 800 impotent people in that same building. It doesn't cost any more money, but it does mean teaching people to use what they have.

Of all the black children who graduate from high school, 80 percent do not go to college, but go to work. Of the 20 percent that go to college, less than 10 percent graduate, and about 3 percent learn something. Since most of our children are going not to college but to work, all of our schools should take pride in offering skills that involve manual dexterity. The notion is ridiculous that if you develop your head you don't have to develop your hand, and if you develop your hand it's because you didn't have a head to develop. That kind of mystique discourages the appreciation of work, not only as a way to earn money but as a way to develop character.

We must distinguish between service and servility. People ought to react against servility because it implies they are operating against their will, but they ought to move toward service because service is power. These concepts have to become a part of the American educational enterprise. Millions of children are immature and impotent at age eighteen, but they don't have to be immature, and they don't have to be impotent. They can be taught to be more mature, and they can make better use of their power.

PENN KEMBLE, American Enterprise Institute: In describing the *Bakke* case you used the analogy of the runners, one of whom suffers a disability. It's a frequently used analogy, and I think it's a very power-

ful one. I also think there's something seriously wrong with it, which goes to the heart of the disagreement over this—as you put it—very upsetting emotional issue.

If there were two runners, one of whom had weights on his feet and, because of those weights, was lagging behind, you would be quite right, I think, in insisting that that runner should be brought up to an even point with the other runners. In such a situation, you would be judging those people as individuals. You would be looking at the performance of one runner who had run this race on his own, as an individual person. You would be ascertaining that he was laboring under some disadvantage, and you would be putting him on an equal footing with another runner.

The problem with the quota issue, with the kind of affirmative action program that was established at the University of California, is that it doesn't look on these people as individuals. It doesn't ask if a runner is indeed behind because of racial discrimination or some other individual disadvantage, or if other runners are ahead because of individual advantages. It simply looks at racial differences. There have been documented instances in which people who are quite privileged have been accorded special rights because of racial quotas. Children of diplomats and of professional people have been given advantages in jobs and admission to schools simply because they are black or Hispanic. That's why people object to a racial quota.

The kind of affirmative action that Michael Novak is describing is entirely different. After looking at people's individual problems and individual records, it determines that some people are under such difficult circumstances that they need some help. I think that if you confuse these two approaches, we are indeed in for a very difficult time.

REVEREND JACKSON: And I'm going to clarify your approach, if you'll listen for a minute. I'm not confused. We were put in slavery, not based upon character or the lack of it, or upon will or the lack of it, but based upon race. We were institutionally, categorically rejected by law. Blacks with good character couldn't use the bathroom downtown. Blacks with Ph.D.'s couldn't stop at the latrine. Race. Don't run from that. That's just real in this culture. It's race.

The latest statistics show that a white high school dropout, without giving him a name, has more job options than a black high school graduate, without giving him a name. As late as 1950, when I was growing up in the South, and they were telling me how qualified we had to be, 65 to 70 percent of the labor force in this country, skilled and semiskilled, were white males without a high school diploma. At that

time, a black with a college degree couldn't be a policeman. As late as 1960, 46 percent of the skilled and semiskilled labor force in high-paying union jobs were white males without a high school diploma. It's in a new book called *Protest, Politics and Prosperity*, by Dorothy K. Newman and funded by the Carnegie Corporation. The evidence is there. Our crisis is essentially not a class one, as some people now want to say; it is essentially a caste one.

There is substantial evidence that many blacks are still categorically rejected because of race, whereas our character and intelligence are not even tested. There is no evidence that there are no black coaches in the National Football League because we can't figure out X's and O's. There is no evidence that there are no black baseball managers because we don't understand baseball. The real evidence is something very different from that.

This society cannot run from its shame, which is race, and from the black man's burden, which is shame. I'm not saying that anyone should feel guilty about what one writer called "The White Man's Shame and the Black Man's Burden," because I don't think guilt is a solution. I think we ought to be responsible about it. To be responsible about it is to accept it as real and do something about it.

Now, I go another step. There is no evidence that the white runner is in front because he has innate speed. He is there in fact because of unfair advantages. To be sure, some white folks can outrun some black folks, and some white folks have got more soul than some black folks. Some black folks haven't got any rhythm, and some white folks can't think, so we don't need to play any funny old games with little individual analogies. The question really is not whether America can stop and support Bakke. The question is how it will adjudge itself and appraise itself if it supports a policy that does not take into account a commitment to overcome its most horrible sin.

Germany killed 6 million Jews, and that was its sin; it was wrong. This country and others have forced Germany to keep paying money for it, which is not any substitute, but the reparations represent some evidence that Germany was wrong and ought to pay for it, and we support that.

If we're going to justify compensation for the extermination of 6 million Jews—and I think we ought to; I keep repeating that—then we ought to support compensation for 60 million blacks, 200 years of slavery, 100 years of segregation.

Do you realize that this is just the twenty-fourth year after the 1954 Supreme Court decision? As late as twenty-four years ago I had to go to an inferior school, by law. Black teachers had to receive inferior salaries, by law. If, in fact, blacks were up in that race, it would not

prove that we are equal, it would prove that we are superior. It would not prove that white people are fair.

MR. WOODSON: We have time for one more question from Mr. Gault and that's it.

MR. RONALD GAULT, Ford Foundation: This is away from the *Bakke* case. In your earlier response to a question about self-reliance, you described some of your work in high schools throughout the country. I've heard you speak on this issue before, and you characterized it as a moral confrontation. The critics of that effort, which I have not heard you address, have said that it is a reflection of a "blame the victim syndrome." Can you expand on that?

REVEREND JACKSON: All right. In a relationship between the victimizer and the victim, the victim is not responsible for being down, but he must be responsible for getting up because he has a greater self-interest in getting up. The victimizer has neither the conscience to pick him up—that's what Bakke is all about—nor the will to do it. The times we have made progress are when the victim has accepted the necessary discipline and sacrifices to survive against the odds. Another way of putting it is to talk about the relationship between slave master and slave. Since the master never gets tired of being master, the slave must always initiate the revolt.

My contention is that if those of us who are behind in medicine wait for the system called AMA to equalize us, we have to be mighty patient. That's my argument. If we depend upon some forces from Washington to shut off the TV and to increase our commitment to literacy in Watts, it is not likely to happen. I am simply saying that the dependency syndrome manifests itself in waiting for some salvation from without, which is never going to show up. There is no evidence that it ever showed up. When we challenge our youth—who are behind in this race, and who have these chains on their ankles—to run faster, we are saying that because they are behind and because they are in a climate of hostility, they cannot follow a philosophy of hedonism. If they start fighting for short-term pleasure, they will end up with long-term pain.

Because we are behind in the race, we cannot afford the luxury of 18,000 hours of TV by the age of fifteen, compared with 11,000 hours of school. We cannot accept that luxury; we are behind. To be victims of a premature pregnancy epidemic because sex feels good is a luxury we can't afford. Whether marijuana is legal or illegal, harmful or not harmful, if marijuana and cocaine and angel dust do not serve as a

stimulus to close that gap, we cannot afford the luxury of the decadence of drugs.

And so our ethical challenge is within the context of knowing that our goal is equity and parity, and our challenge is to close that gap. That is the basis of our push for excellence—challenge.

[Applause.]